



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/945,249	02/02/98	VERE HODGE	R P31158

020462 HM42/0105
SMITHKLINE BEECHAM CORPORATION
709 SWEDLAND ROAD P O BOX 1539
KING OF PRUSSIA PA 19406-0939

EXAMINER

TRAVERS, R

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1614

DATE MAILED: 01/05/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Examiner	Group Art Unit		

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10/1/98
- ☐ This action is FINAL.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1, + 3-20 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) 3, + 5-20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1 + 4 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
 - ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.
 - ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 1.7.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s) _____
- ☐ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit:

The amendment filed October 1, 1998 has been received and entered into the file.

Claims 1 and 3-20 are presented for examination.

Applicant's election with traverse of Group I, claims 1 and 4 in Paper No. 9 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that restriction was not required in the international examination process. This is not found persuasive because failure to require additional fees to examine all included inventions fails to preclude the instant restriction..

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claims 1 and 4 will be examined to the extent they read on the elected subject matter.

Claims 15-20 reading on non-elected subject matter are withdrawn from consideration.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The specification is objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to adequately teach how to make and/or use the invention, and thereby failing to provide an enabling disclosure.

The instant specification fails to provide information that would allow the skilled artisan to practice the instant invention without undue experimentation. Attention is directed to *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (CAFC 1988) at 1404 where the court set forth the eight factors to

Art Unit:

consider when assessing if a disclosure would have required undue experimentation. Citing *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546 (BdApls 1986) at 547 the court recited eight factors:

- 1) the quantity of experimentation necessary,
- 2) the amount of direction or guidance provided,
- 3) the presence of absence of working examples,
- 4) the nature of the invention,
- 5) the state of the prior art,
- 6) the relative skill of those in the art
- 7) the predictability of the art, and
- 8) the breadth of the claims.

Applicant fails to set forth the criteria that defines a "bioprecursor". Additionally, Applicant fails to provide information allowing the skilled artisan to ascertain these compounds without undue experimentation. In the instant case, only a limited number of "bioprecursor" examples are set forth, thereby failing to provide sufficient working examples. It is noted that these examples are neither exhaustive, nor define the class of compounds required. The pharmaceutical art is unpredictable, requiring each embodiment to be individually assessed for physiological activity. The instant claims read on all "bioprecursor", necessitating an exhaustive search for the embodiments suitable to practice the claimed invention. Applicants fail to provide information sufficient to practice the claimed invention, absent undue experimentation.

Art Unit:

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for the reasons set forth in the objection to the specification.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 4 is rendered indefinite by the phrase "bioprecursor" and thereby failing to clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. Examples of what a "bioprecursor" would be are not set forth in the specification. Absent such exemplification, the skilled artisan could not establish the identity of compounds that were a "bioprecursor". Applicant's phrase fails to clearly define the subject matter encompassed by the instant claims, thus is properly rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kenig et al or Sutton et al or Boyd et al, all of record.

Art Unit:

out 5, -8, 9 - 14 (15 out)
1, 4, 15 - 20

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Kenig et al or Sutton et al or Boyd et al, all of record..

Kenig et al or Sutton et al or Boyd et al, all of record. teach the claimed compounds as old and well known in combination with various pharmaceutical carriers and excipients in a dosage form. These medicament are taught as useful for treating those viral diseases herein claimed. Claims 1 and 4, and the primary references, as to:

1) various isomers employed as the preferred therapeutic agents.

The skilled artisan, possessing a compound for a particular therapeutic use possesses all isomers, analogs, homologs, bioisosteres, acids, esters and salts of such compounds for that same use. In the instant case, the claims read on employing compounds residing in the prior art, for the same use. Absent information illustrating some unexpected benefit residing in those prior art

Art Unit:

compounds, unidentified in the prior art; the instant claims, reading on obvious subject matter remain properly rejected as obvious.

No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Russell Travers at telephone number (703) 308-4603.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'RT' or similar initials, enclosed within a large, loopy oval shape.

**Russell Travers
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1614**